SINGLE BENCH

(7)

CF1002

(4)

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, CHHATTISGARH
At BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (S) No. 5056 / 2006

PETITIONER : **Govind Bhatore**
S/o Late Shri. D.N.Bhatore,
Aged about 39 Years,
Assistant Draftsman (Mech.),
H.E.M. Division,
Water Resources Department, Raipur,
Residing at : 27/56, New Shanti Nagar,
RAIPUR – 492001 (CG).

P.R. No. 5076/06
Presented by Sri B.P. Rao
12/9/06

Versus

RESPONDENTS :

1. **Union of India**
Through : The Secretary,
Ministry of Personnel, Public
Grievances, and Pension,
Pension & Pensioners' Department,
310, Loknayak Bhawan,
NEW DELHI – 110003.

2. **State of Chhattisgarh**
Through : The Secretary,
Water Resources Department,
D.K.S.Bhawan, Mantralaya,
RAIPUR – 492001 (CG)

3. **State of Madhya Pradesh**
Through : The Chief Secretary,
Water Resources Department,
Vallabh Bhawan, **BHOPAL**(MP)

4. **The Chief Secretary,**
State Re-Organisation Cell,
General Administration Department,
Mantralaya, **BHOPAL** (MP)

5. **The Chief Secretary,**
Water Resources Department,
Vallabh Bhawan, Mantralaya,
BHOPAL(MP).

RECEIVED-COPY
12/9/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

RLS Bhawani
13/09/06
Clerk
THAKUR VIJAY SINGH
Asst. Solicitor General of India
CHHATTISGARH HIGH COURT
High Court Campus, Bilaspur (C.G.)

B.P. Rao
Advocate

(5)

6. **Shri. Mewalal Tandan**
S/o Shri. Vikram Das Tandan,
Aged about 43 years,
Assistant Draughtsman,
Rural Mechanical Services,
Water Resources Department,
BILASPUR- 495001 (CG).

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 / 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR THE ISSUANCE OF APPROPRIATE ORDER AND DIRECTIONS IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARY, MANDAMUS ETC.

52

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

W. P.S. No. 5056 of 2006

Petitioner : Govind Bhatore

Versus

Respondents : Union of India & others

Shri B. P. Rao, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Rajneesh Shrivastava, Advocate on the authority of Shri Shailendra Dubey, Standing counsel for the respondent No.1.

Smt. Anju Ahuja, Deputy Govt. Advocate for the respondent No. 2.

None for the other respondents.

O R D E R

(18th September, 2006)

1. The petitioner, by way of this petition, filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution, seeks a direction to the respondents No. 1 and 2 to consider his case along with respondent No.6 for mutual transfer.
2. On query as to whether the petitioner has any right or whether there is any provision of law or circular or executive instructions, which provide for mutual transfer, and whether the said right is enforceable by this Court or not. The petitioner has nothing to submit except that there is one circular which is in the nature of guidelines for consideration of case of employees requesting for mutual transfer.
3. It is well settled principle of law that in absence of a right which is enforceable by Court of law, extra ordinary jurisdiction of this Court cannot be invoked. Even otherwise, looking from any angle, there is no merit in the case.
4. The petition is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Thakur